

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-17 remain in the application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 12 and 14 are amended to improve form and consistency within the claim.

#### **A. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.**

Claims 2-3, 5, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. The claim amendments are believed to overcome the basis for rejection stated in the office action. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

#### **B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102.**

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 based upon Ebata et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 calls for, a web server within the intermediary server for formatting the obtained data into a web page that is responsive to a particular web access request. Ebata et al. do not show a web server either within or outside of the proxy server. Ebata et al. do not contemplate formatting data obtained into a web page that is responsive to a web access request. Moreover, Ebata et al. do not suggest any changes that would alter the proxy server to include a web server, nor provide any motivation that would lead one to make such a change. For at least these reasons claim 1 is not anticipated nor made obvious by Ebata et al.

Claims 2-10 that depend from claim 1 are allowable over Ebata et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1 as well as the limitations that appear in those claims.

Independent claim 11 calls for generating a web page using the intermediary server, where the web page uses database content obtained from the data server. Claim 11 further calls for delivering the web page to a client application. Ebata et al. do not show or fairly suggest generating a web page of any kind. Specifically, Ebata et al. do not show or suggest generating and delivering a web page that contains content obtained from a data server. For at

least these reasons claim 11 is neither anticipated nor made obvious by Ebata et al.

Claims 12-17 that depend from claim 11 are allowable over Ebata et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1 as well as the limitations that appear in those claims.


**C. Conclusion.**

The references that were cited but not relied upon are no more relevant than the references that were relied upon. In view of all of the above, claims 1-17 are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

February 24, 2005

  
Stuart T. Langley, Reg. No. 33,940  
Hogan & Hartson LLP  
One Tabor Center  
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
(720) 406-5335 Tel  
(303) 899-7333 Fax